

REMARKS

Claim Objections

Claim 5 stands objected to for improperly depending on Claim 2. Claim 5 has been amended to properly depend on Claim 4.

Claim 5 also stands objected to for missing the word “on” in the limitation “...said horizontal tracks that turns all interconnect elements” Claim 5 has been amended so that the limitation properly reads “...said horizontal tracks that turns on all interconnect elements....”

Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 5 is currently in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 2-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Examiner asserts that there is insufficient antecedent basis for “selected input stimuli” in these claims.

Applicants have amended Claims 2-4, replacing “selected input stimuli” with “said plurality of signal sources”, for which sufficient antecedent basis is found on Page 29, lines 8-18 of the Specification.

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2-4 are currently in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Abramovici et al. (US 6,108,806).

Directing Examiner’s attention to MPEP 2131, the threshold issue under Section 102 is whether the Examiner has established a *prima facie* case for anticipation. “A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union*

Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)". "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ...claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Amended Claim 1 recites a method of testing the routing circuitry in a field programmable gate array (FPGA) having a first FPGA tile "wherein said first FPGA tile comprises a plurality of interface groups (IGs), each of said IGs having a plurality of input multiplexers configurable to select signals received from outside of said FPGA tile and provide signals to said routing circuitry inside said FPGA tile, and a plurality of input/output pads (I/Os) coupled to at least one of said input multiplexers of at least one of said IGs."

Abramovici does not disclose the configuration of input multiplexers and input/output pads as recited in Claim 1. In the Notice of Allowance dated May 31, 2002 for the parent application (Serial No. 09/654,240) of the present invention, the examiner even admits that none of the prior art teaches each of the interface groups (IGs) having a plurality of input multiplexers configurable to select signals received from outside of the FPGA tile and provide signals to the regular routing structure inside the FPGA tile; and a plurality of input/output pads (I/Os) coupled to at least one of said input multiplexers of at least one of said IGs.

Amended Claims 2-3 are patentable for the same reasons as stated above for Claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-3 are currently in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 4 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Abramovici et al. (US 6,108,806), in view of Wells et al. (US 6,651,238).

For a §103 obviousness rejection to be proper, the Examiner must meet the burden of establishing that all elements of the invention are disclosed in the prior art; that the prior art relied upon, coupled with knowledge generally available in the art at the time of the invention, must contain some suggestion or incentive that would have motivated the skilled artisan to modify a reference or combined references; and that the proposed

modification of the prior art must have had a reasonable expectation of success, determined from the vantage point of the skilled artisan at the time the invention was made. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In Re Wilson*, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970); *Amgen v. Chugai Pharmaceuticals Co.*, 927 U.S.P.Q.2d 1016, 1023 (Fed. Cir. 1996).

Amended Claim 4 contains the same limitations as Claims 1-3 with respect to the configuration of input multiplexers and input/output(I/O) pads. Neither Abramovici nor Wells discloses these claim elements.

As mentioned above, the examiner even admits in the Notice of Allowance for the parent application that none of the prior art teaches these claim limitations.

Since neither Abramovici nor Wells discloses these claim elements, their combination cannot teach them. Therefore, it would not have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to combine Abramovici and Wells in order to arrive at the present invention.

Since Claim 5 depends from Claim 4, it is also patentable as it includes the same limitations as its parent claim.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 4 and 5 are currently in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any questions regarding this application, the Examiner may telephone the undersigned at 775-586-9500.

Respectfully submitted,
SIERRA PATENT GROUP, LTD.



John Crosby
Reg. No.: 49,058

Dated: November 29, 2004

Sierra Patent Group, Ltd.
P.O. Box 6149
Stateline, NV 89449
(775) 586-9500 (775) 586-9550 Fax